arXiv:1603.07821v1 [math.AG] 25 Mar 2016

ON SIMPLY-LACED GENERALIZED ROOT SYSTEMS

SHUNSUKE NAKAMURA, YUUKI SHIRAISHI, AND ATSUSHI TAKAHASHI

Abstract. We show the uniqueness and existence of the Euler form for a simply-laced generalized root system. This enables us to show that the Coxeter element for a simply-laced generalized root system is admissible in the sense of R. W. Carter. As an application, the isomorphism classes of simply-laced generalized root systems with positive definite Cartan forms are classified by Cartar's admissible diagrams associated to their Coxeter elements.

1. Introduction

The notion of simply-laced generalized root systems is introduced by Kyoji Saito [4] in his study of period mappings of primitive forms in the deformation theory of isolated hypersurface singularities. This is an axiomatization of the tuple consisting of the middle homology group of the Milnor fibration, the intersection form, the set of vanishing cycles and the Milnor monodromy (see Definition 2.1). One of the most famous examples of them is from the deformation theory of a simple elliptic singularity, which is called an elliptic root system. The elliptic root systems and the Lie algebras associated to them are beyond the theory of Kac–Moody Lie algebras. This class is extensively studied by many researchers including K. Saito. We suggest only [5, 6] here for the relevance to the present paper. A finite root system, an affine root systems, or the set of real roots in the lattice with the Cartan form of a Kac–Moody Lie algebra, which is called a KM root system here, also appears as a substructure of a simply-laced generalized root system. The difference between simply-laced generalized root systems and such root systems is the Coxeter element, which plays an important role.

Certain simply-laced generalized systems are constructed from the deformation theory of affine cusp polynomials $x_1 + x_2^{a_2} + x_3^{a_3} - cx_1x_2x_3$ (see [7, 8, 10]). If we forget their Coxeter elements, then they all give the affine root system of type $\widetilde{A}_{a_2+a_3}$. These simply-laced generalized root systems have the different Coxeter elements corresponding to different pairs (a_2, a_3) with $a_2 \leq a_3$ and hence they are non-isomorphic to each other. Therefore, simply-laced generalized root systems have finer information than the usual

Date: March 28, 2016.

ones. Due to the Coxeter elements, simply-laced generalized root systems can be equipped with not only representation theoretic information but also geometric one.

Except for studies of elliptic root systems mentioned above, general properties of simply-laced generalized root systems are hardly known. However, it is shown by [8] that they are constructed from triangulated categories with good algebraic origins; the tuple consisting of the Grothendieck group, the symmetrized Euler form, the set of isomorphic classes of exceptional collections and the automorphism induced by the Serre functor. It is important to note here that the Euler form, the definitely important pairing, gives the Cartan form. Therefore, it is natural to ask whether a simply-laced generalized root system has such a nice bilinear form.

The main result of the present paper is the following positive answer to this:

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 2.11)**.** *Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ be a simply-laced generalized root system. There exists a unique non-degenerate bilinear form $\chi_R : K_0(R) \times K_0(R) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying the following properties*:

(i) *We have $I_R = \chi_R + \chi_R^T$, namely,*

$$I_R(\lambda, \lambda') = \chi_R(\lambda, \lambda') + \chi_R(\lambda', \lambda), \quad \lambda, \lambda' \in K_0(R).$$

(ii) *We have*

$$\chi_R(\lambda, \lambda') = -\chi_R(\lambda', c_R\lambda), \quad \lambda, \lambda' \in K_0(R).$$

In particular, the Coxeter transformation c_R is equal to $-\chi_R^{-1}\chi_R^T$.

If the Cartan form of a simply-laced generalized root system is positive definite, we can show that the Coxeter element is admissible (see Definition 3.5) in the sense of R. W. Carter (see Proposition 3.9) by Theorem 2.11. Here we define morphisms between simply-laced generalized root systems as isometric $\mathbb{Z}$–homomorphisms which are compatible with Coxeter transformations and induce maps between the sets of real roots (see Definition 2.6). Then we can classify isomorphism classes of simply-laced generalized root systems whose Cartan forms are positive definite by admissible diagrams introduced and classified by R. W. Carter:

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 3.12)**.** *Let $\mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}}$ be the set of irreducible positive definite generalized root systems, Γ the set of diagrams in Proposition 3.6* (ii) *and A_R the diagram in Proposition 3.6* (ii) *which is isomorphic to the admissible diagram associated to the Coxeter element c_R of R. The map*

$$\varphi : \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}} \longrightarrow \Gamma, \quad R \mapsto A_R,$$

induces the natural bijection:

$$\overline{\varphi} : \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}}/\sim \xrightarrow{\cong} \Gamma, \quad [R] \mapsto A_R,$$

where $[R]$ *is the isomorphism class of* $R \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}}$.

Acknowledgment

The first and second named authors would like to thank Akishi Ikeda and Tadashi Ishibe for valuable discussions and encouragement. The second named author is supported by Research Fellowships of Japan Society for the Promotion for Young Scientists. The third named author is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 24684005.

2. Simply-laced generalized root systems

2.1. **Simply-laced generalized root systems and morphisms.** We recall the definition of simply-laced generalized root systems introduced by K. Saito [4]. In addition, we define a certain class of morphisms between simply-laced generalized root systems.

Definition 2.1. A *simply-laced generalized root system* R of rank μ consists of

- a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module $K_0(R)$ of rank μ called the *root lattice*,
- a symmetric bilinear form $I_R : K_0(R) \times K_0(R) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ called the *Cartan form*,
- a subset $\Delta_{re}(R)$ of $K_0(R)$ called the *set of real roots*,
- an element c_R of $W(R)$ called the *Coxeter transformation*,

such that

(i) $K_0(R) = \mathbb{Z}\Delta_{re}(R)$.

(ii) For all $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, $I_R(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$.

(iii) For all $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, the element r_α of $\mathrm{Aut}(K_0(R), I_R)$, the group of automorphisms of $K_0(R)$ respecting I_R, defined by

$$r_\alpha(\lambda) := \lambda - I_R(\lambda, \alpha)\alpha, \quad \lambda \in K_0(R)$$

makes $\Delta_{re}(R)$ invariant, namely, $r_\alpha(\Delta_{re}(R)) = \Delta_{re}(R)$.

(iv) Let $W(R)$ be the *Weyl group* of R defined by

$$W(R) := \langle r_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R) \rangle \subset \mathrm{Aut}(K_0(R), I_R)\rangle.$$

Then there exists an ordered set $B = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\mu)$ of elements of $\Delta_{re}(R)$ called a *root basis* of R which satisfies

(a) $K_0(R) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\mu} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i$,

(b) $W(R) = \langle r_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, r_{\alpha_\mu} \rangle$,

(c) $\Delta_{re}(R) = W(R)B$,
(d) $c_R = r_{\alpha_1} \cdots r_{\alpha_\mu}$.

Definition 2.2. Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ be a simply-laced generalized root system. R is called *reducible* if there exist subsets $\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \subset \Delta_{re}(R)$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$\Delta_{re}(R) = \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2,\ \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2 = \emptyset,$$
$$I_R(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha_1 \in \Delta_1,\ \alpha_2 \in \Delta_2.$$

A simply-laced generalized root system R is called *irreducible* if R is not reducible.

Definition 2.3. Put

$$\mathrm{rad}(I_R) := \{\lambda \in K_0(R) \mid I_R(\lambda, \lambda') = 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda' \in K_0(R)\}$$

and call it the radical of R.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ be a simply-laced generalized root system.*

(i) *If $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, then $-\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$.*
(ii) *Suppose that $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$. Then $c\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$ for some constant $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $c = \pm 1$.*
(iii) *If $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, then $r_{-\alpha} = r_\alpha$.*

Proof. It is almost clear from the facts that $-\alpha = r_\alpha(\alpha)$, $I_R(c\alpha, c\alpha) = 2c^2$ and the definition of reflections. □

Proposition 2.5. *Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ be a simply-laced generalized root system. Let $I : K_0(R) \times K_0(R) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a symmetric bilinear form which satisfies the following conditions*:

- *For all $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, we have $I(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$.*
- *For all $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, we have $I(r_\alpha(\lambda), r_\alpha(\lambda')) = I(\lambda, \lambda')$ for all $\lambda, \lambda' \in K_0(R)$.*

Then we have $I = I_R$.

Proof. For all $\lambda \in K_0(R)$ and $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(\lambda, \alpha) &= I(r_\alpha(\lambda), r_\alpha(\alpha)) = -I(r_\alpha(\lambda), \alpha) \\ &= -I\left(\lambda - I_R(\lambda, \alpha)\alpha, \alpha\right) = -I(\lambda, \alpha) + 2I_R(\lambda, \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $I(\lambda, \alpha) = I_R(\lambda, \alpha)$ and hence $I = I_R$. □

Definition 2.6. Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ and $R' = (K_0(R'), I_{R'}, \Delta_{re}(R'), c_{R'})$ be simply-laced generalized root systems. A *morphism* $\phi : R \longrightarrow R'$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-homomorphism $\phi : K_0(R) \longrightarrow K_0(R')$ satisfying the following conditions:

(i) For all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in K_0(R)$, we have

$$I_{R'}\left(\phi(\lambda_1), \phi(\lambda_2)\right) = I_R(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

(ii) For all $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, we have $\phi(\alpha) \in \Delta_{re}(R')$.

(iii) We have $\phi \circ c_R = c_{R'} \circ \phi$, namely, The following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_0(R) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & K_0(R') \\ {\scriptstyle c_R}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle c_{R'}} \\ K_0(R) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & K_0(R') \end{array}.$$

Remark 2.7. The notion of isomorphisms of simply-laced generalized root systems is defined in the obvious way. Namely, a morphism $\phi : R \longrightarrow R'$ is an isomorphism if there exists a morphism $\psi : R' \longrightarrow R$ such that $\psi \circ \phi = \mathrm{id}_R$ and $\phi \circ \psi = \mathrm{id}_{R'}$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ and $R' = (K_0(R'), I_{R'}, \Delta_{re}(R'), c_{R'})$ be simply-laced generalized root systems and $\phi : R \longrightarrow R'$ a morphism. If $\lambda \in K_0(R)$ satisfies $\phi(\lambda) = 0$, then λ belongs to* $\mathrm{rad}(I_R)$.

Proof. For all $\lambda' \in K_0(R)$, we have

$$I_R(\lambda, \lambda') = I_{R'}\left(\phi(\lambda), \phi(\lambda')\right) = 0.$$

Therefore this lemma holds. □

Lemma 2.9. *Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ and $R' = (K_0(R'), I_{R'}, \Delta_{re}(R'), c_{R'})$ be simply-laced generalized root systems and $\phi : R \longrightarrow R'$ a morphism. For $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, we have*

$$\phi \circ r_\alpha = r_{\phi(\alpha)} \circ \phi.$$

Proof. For any $\lambda \in K_0(R)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi\left(r_\alpha(\lambda)\right) &= \phi\left(\lambda - I_R(\lambda, \alpha)\alpha\right) \\ &= \phi(\lambda) - I_R(\lambda, \alpha)\phi(\alpha) \\ &= \phi(\lambda) - I_{R'}\left(\phi(\lambda), \phi(\alpha)\right)\phi(\alpha) \\ &= r_{\phi(\alpha)}\left(\phi(\lambda)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore this lemma holds. □

Lemma 2.10. *Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ and $R' = (K_0(R'), I_{R'}, \Delta_{re}(R'), c_{R'})$ be simply-laced generalized root systems and $\phi : R \longrightarrow R'$ a morphism. The $\mathbb{Z}$-submodule $\mathrm{Im}(\phi) \subset K_0(R')$ is invariant under the Coxeter transformation $c_{R'}$:*

$$c_{R'}\left(\mathrm{Im}(\phi)\right) \subset \mathrm{Im}(\phi).$$

Proof. It is obvious from the definition $c_{R'} \circ \phi = \phi \circ c_R$. □

2.2. **Euler form.** In this subsection, we show the existence and uniqueness of the Euler form on a simply-laced generalized root system.

Theorem 2.11. *Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ be a simply-laced generalized root system. There exists a unique non-degenerate bilinear form $\chi_R : K_0(R) \times K_0(R) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying the following properties*:

(i) *We have $I_R = \chi_R + \chi_R^T$, namely,*

$$I_R(\lambda, \lambda') = \chi_R(\lambda, \lambda') + \chi_R(\lambda', \lambda), \quad \lambda, \lambda' \in K_0(R). \tag{2.1a}$$

(ii) *We have*

$$\chi_R(\lambda, \lambda') = -\chi_R(\lambda', c_R\lambda), \quad \lambda, \lambda' \in K_0(R). \tag{2.1b}$$

In particular, the Coxeter transformation c_R is equal to $-\chi_R^{-1}\chi_R^T$.

Proof. First, we show the existence of such a bilinear form. We prove it by exactly the same argument in Proposition 2.4 in [3]:

Lemma 2.12. *Let $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\mu)$ be a root basis of a simply-laced generalized root system R. Define the bilinear form χ_R on $K_0(R)$ by the upper triangular part of the Cartan matrix I_R, namely,*

$$\chi_R(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) := \begin{cases} I_R(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) & \text{if} \quad i < j, \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad i = j, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad i > j. \end{cases}$$

Then the bilinear form χ_R satisfies the properties in Theorem 2.11.

Proof. Set $E_i := (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \mu$. We show this lemma by the induction for i. For $y = m\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{Z}\alpha_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_R(y, r_{\alpha_1}(x)) &= \chi_R(y, x) - I_R(x, \alpha_1) \cdot \chi_R(y, \alpha_1) \\ &= \chi_R(y, x) - I_R(x, \alpha_1) \cdot m \\ &= \chi_R(y, x) - I_R(x, y) = -\chi_R(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $\chi_R(y, r_{\alpha_1} \cdots r_{\alpha_i}(x)) = -\chi_R(x, y)$ for $y \in \bigoplus_{j=1}^{i} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j$. Under this assumption, we shall show that $\chi_R(y, r_{\alpha_1} \cdots r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x)) = -\chi_R(x, y)$ for $y \in \bigoplus_{j=1}^{i+1} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j$. In order to

show this, it is sufficient to consider the following two cases; $y \in \bigoplus_{j=1}^{i} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j$ and $y \in \mathbb{Z}\alpha_{i+1}$.

For the case that $y \in \bigoplus_{j=1}^{i} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_R(y, r_{\alpha_1} \cdots r_{\alpha_i} \cdot r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x)) &= -\chi_R(r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x), y) \\ &= -\chi_R(r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x) - x, y) - \chi_R(x, y) \\ &= -\chi_R(x, y),\end{aligned}$$

since $r_{\alpha_{i+1}} \cdots r_{\alpha_\mu}(x) - x \in \bigoplus_{j=i+1}^{\mu} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j$. For the case that $y = m\alpha_{i+1} \in \mathbb{Z}\alpha_{i+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_R(y, r_{\alpha_1} \cdots r_{\alpha_i} \cdot r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x)) &= \chi_R(y, r_{\alpha_1} \cdots r_{\alpha_i} \cdot r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x) - r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x)) + \chi_R(y, r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x)) \\ &= \chi_R(y, r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x)) \\ &= \chi_R(y, x) - I_R(x, \alpha_{i+1}) \cdot \chi_R(y, \alpha_{i+1}) \\ &= \chi_R(y, x) - I_R(x, \alpha_{i+1}) \cdot m \\ &= \chi_R(y, x) - I_R(x, y) = -\chi_R(x, y)\end{aligned}$$

since $r_{\alpha_1} \cdots r_{\alpha_i} \cdot r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x) - r_{\alpha_{i+1}}(x) \in \bigoplus_{j=1}^{i} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j$. Therefore this lemma holds. □

We show the following lemma necessary to prove the uniqueness.

Lemma 2.13. *There exist finitely many sub* $\mathbb{Z}$*–modules* $V_{\mathbf{i}}$ *indexed by a certain finite set* $\mathcal{I}$ *satisfying the following conditions*:

(i) $\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} V_{\mathbf{i}} = K_0(R)$.

(ii) $V_{\mathbf{i}} \oplus \mathrm{rad}(I_R) = K_0(R)$ *for all* $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}$. *In particular, the restriction of* I_R *to* $V_{\mathbf{i}} \times V_{\mathbf{i}}$ *is non-degenerate for all* $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}$.

Proof. Set $\mu_0 := \mathrm{rank}\ \mathrm{rad}(I_R)$. We shall construct the sub $\mathbb{Z}$–modules $V_{\mathbf{i}}$ explicitly. It is obvious that there exists a $\mathbb{Z}$–basis $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\mu$ of $K_0(R)$ such that the restriction of I_R to $\sum_{i=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} \mathbb{Z}\beta_i \times \sum_{i=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} \mathbb{Z}\beta_i$ is non-degenerate and $I_R(\beta_j, \beta_j) \neq 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, \mu$. Indeed we can take $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\mu$ as an appropriate permutation of the initial root basis $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\mu)$.

A $\mathbb{Z}$–basis of rad (I_R) can be written as follows:

$$\delta_i := \sum_{k=1}^{\mu} m_{ik}\beta_k, \quad i = 1, \ldots \mu_0.$$

If there exists a nontrivial sequence of integers $(k_1, \dots k_{\mu_0})$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_0} k_j \left(\sum_{k=\mu-\mu_0+1}^{\mu} m_{jk}\beta_k \right) = 0, \tag{2.2}$$

then the equation (2.2) implies $\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_0} k_j\delta_j \in \sum_{i=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} \mathbb{Z}\beta_i$ by the equations

$$\sum_{k=\mu-\mu_0+1}^{\mu} m_{jk}\beta_k = \delta_j - \sum_{k=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} m_{jk}\beta_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, \mu_0. \tag{2.3}$$

The equation (2.2) is contradictory to the assumption for $\sum_{i=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} \mathbb{Z}\beta_i$. Hence the elements $\sum_{k=\mu-\mu_0+1}^{\mu} m_{jk}\beta_k$ for $j = 1, \dots, \mu_0$ are linearly independent. Moreover, by the equation (2.3), we have the following equation:

$$K_0(R) = \sum_{i=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} \mathbb{Z}\beta_i + \sum_{i=1}^{\mu_0} \mathbb{Z}\delta_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} \mathbb{Z}\beta_i + \sum_{i=1}^{\mu_0} \mathbb{Z}\left(\sum_{k=\mu-\mu_0+1}^{\mu} m_{ik}\beta_k \right). \tag{2.4}$$

Thus the elements β_i for $i = 1, \dots, \mu - \mu_0$ and $\sum_{k=\mu-\mu_0+1}^{\mu} m_{jk}\beta_k$ for $j = 1, \dots, \mu_0$ are generators of $K_0(R)$.

We consider the following $\mathbb{Z}$–homomorphism $f : K_0(R) \to K_0(R)$:

$$\begin{cases} f(\beta_i) = \beta_i \quad \text{if} \quad i = 1, \dots, \mu - \mu_0, \\ f(\beta_{i+\mu-\mu_0}) = \sum_{k=\mu-\mu_0+1}^{\mu} m_{ik}\beta_k \quad \text{if} \quad i = 1, \dots, \mu_0. \end{cases}$$

By the equation (2.4), we have $\mathrm{Coker}(f) = 0$. We denote the representation matrix of f restricted to the sub $\mathbb{Z}$–module $\sum_{k=\mu-\mu_0}^{\mu} \mathbb{Z}\beta_k$ as follows:

$$M' := \begin{pmatrix} a_{\mu-\mu_0+11} & \cdots & a_{\mu-\mu_0+1j} & \cdots & a_{\mu-\mu_0+1\mu_0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & & \vdots \\ a_{k1} & & a_{kj} & & a_{k\mu_0} \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{\mu 1} & \cdots & a_{\mu j} & \cdots & a_{\mu\mu_0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

If the absolute value of $\det(M')$ is greater than one, the cokernel of f is nontrivial and has torsions by the theory of elementary divisors.

By the above argument, the matrix M' is an element in $\mathrm{GL}(\mu_0, \mathbb{Z})$. Then we have the following equation:

$$(\beta_{\mu-\mu_0+1}, \dots, \beta_\mu) = (\delta_1, \dots \delta_{\mu_0})(M')^{-1} + (-\sum_{k=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} m_{1k}\beta_k, \dots, -\sum_{k=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} m_{\mu_0 k}\beta_k)(M')^{-1}.$$

We set $L_i^{(1)}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{\mu_0})$ and $L_i^{(2)}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\mu-\mu_0})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}(L_1^{(1)}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{\mu_0}), \dots, L_{\mu_0}^{(1)}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{\mu_0})) &:= (\delta_1, \dots \delta_{\mu_0})(M')^{-1} \\ (L_1^{(2)}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\mu-\mu_0}), \dots, L_{\mu_0}^{(2)}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\mu-\mu_0}) &:= (-\sum_{k=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} m_{1k}\beta_k, \dots, -\sum_{k=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} m_{\mu_0 k}\beta_k)(M')^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that the elements $L_i^{(1)}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{\mu_0})$ for $i = 1, \dots, \mu_0$ form a $\mathbb{Z}$–basis of $\mathrm{rad}(I_R)$ by their constructions.

Since $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_\mu$ are linearly independent, we can define the following set:

$$\mathrm{Supp}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\mu} m_k\beta_k\right) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, \mu\} | m_i \neq 0\}.$$

Since $I_R(\beta_{\mu-\mu_0+i}, \beta_{\mu-\mu_0+i}) \neq 0$, we have $\mathrm{Supp}(L_i^{(2)}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\mu-\mu_0})) \neq \emptyset$. For $i = 1, \dots, \mu_0$, we take numbers $p_i \in \mathrm{Supp}(L_i^{(2)}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\mu-\mu_0}))$. We check that the following sub $\mathbb{Z}$–modules $V_{(i,p_i)}$ and the sub $\mathbb{Z}$–module $V_1 := \sum_{i=1}^{\mu-\mu_0} \mathbb{Z}\beta_i$ are the desired ones:

$$V_{(i,p_i)} := \mathbb{Z}\beta_{\mu-\mu_0+i} + \sum_{1\leq j\leq \mu-\mu_0, j\neq p_i} \mathbb{Z}\beta_j, \quad i = 1, \dots \mu_0.$$

A nonzero element in $V_{(i,p_i)}$ and $L_j^{(1)}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{\mu_0})$ for all $j = 1, \dots, \mu_0$ are linearly independent. Hence the restriction I_R to $V_{(i,p_i)} \times V_{(i,p_i)}$ is non-degenerate. In addition, we have $\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathcal{I}} V_{\mathbf{i}} = K_0(R)$ and $V_{\mathbf{i}} \oplus \mathrm{rad}(I_R) = K_0(R)$ for each element $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}$ where we set $\mathcal{I} := \{1, (1, p_1), \dots, (\mu_0, p_{\mu_0})\}$. □

Next, we show the uniqueness of such a bilinear form.

Lemma 2.14. *Assume that there exists a non-degenerate bilinear form χ satisfying* (2.1a) *and* (2.1b). *Then the bilinear form χ is unique.*

Proof. Set $B_{\mathbf{i},1} := \{\beta_j\}_{\beta_j\in V_{\mathbf{i}}}$ and $B_{\mathbf{i},2} := \{L_j^{(1)}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{\mu_0})\}_{1\leq j\leq\mu_0}$ as in Lemma 2.13 and denote by $I_{\mathbf{i}}$, $X_{\mathbf{i}}$ and $C_{\mathbf{i}}$ the representation matrices of I_R, χ and c_R concerning the $\mathbb{Z}$–basis $B_{\mathbf{i},1} \cup B_{\mathbf{i},2}$ respectively.

The bilinear form χ (resp. I_R) defines an element in $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K_0(R), \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K_0(R), \mathbb{Z}))$ by $a \mapsto (b \mapsto \chi(a, b))$ (resp. $a \mapsto (b \mapsto I_R(a, b))$). Then $X_{\mathbf{i}}^{-1}$ is the representation matrix

between the $\mathbb{Z}$–bases $B'_{\mathbf{i},1} \cup B'_{\mathbf{i},2}$ and $B_{\mathbf{i},1} \cup B_{\mathbf{i},2}$ where $B'_{\mathbf{i},1}$ and $B'_{\mathbf{i},2}$ are the dual $\mathbb{Z}$–basis of $B_{\mathbf{i},1}$ and $B_{\mathbf{i},2}$ respectively.

Denote by $(M)_{B,B'}$ the submatrix of the representation matrix M corresponding to sub $\mathbb{Z}$–bases B and B'. The submatrix $(I_{\mathbf{i}})_{B_{\mathbf{i},1}B'_{\mathbf{i},1}}$ is invertible by Lemma 2.13. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}(X_{\mathbf{i}}^{-1})_{B'_{\mathbf{i},1},B_{\mathbf{i},1}} &= (\mathbf{1}_{(\mu-\mu_0)\times(\mu-\mu_0)} - (C_{\mathbf{i}})_{B_{\mathbf{i},1},B_{\mathbf{i},1}})((I_{\mathbf{i}})_{B_{\mathbf{i},1}B'_{\mathbf{i},1}})^{-1},\\ (X_{\mathbf{i}}^{-1})_{B'_{\mathbf{i},1},B_{\mathbf{i},2}} &= -((C_{\mathbf{i}})_{B_{\mathbf{i},1},B_{\mathbf{i},2}})((I_{\mathbf{i}})_{B_{\mathbf{i},1},B'_{\mathbf{i},1}})^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we can determine the representation matrix of χ^{-1} concerning the $\mathbb{Z}$–bases $\bigcup_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathcal{I}} B'_{\mathbf{i},1}$ and $\bigcup_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathcal{I}} B_{\mathbf{i},1}$. Therefore, the bilinear form χ should be unique if it exists. □

We have finished the proof of this theorem. □

Definition 2.15. Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ be a simply-laced generalized root system. The bilinear form χ_R in Proposition 2.11 is called the *Euler form* of R.

2.3. **Properties of morphisms.** In this subsection, we give a sufficient condition for monomorphism. Moreover we also give an example of a morphism which is not monomorphism.

Proposition 2.16. *Let $\phi : R \to R'$ be a morphism. If the Cartan form I_R of R is non-degenerate, then ϕ is a monomorphism.*

Proof. We show that a morphism ϕ induces an isometric $\mathbb{Z}$–homomorphism for Euler forms:

Lemma 2.17. *Let $\phi : R \to R'$ be a morphism. Assume that the Cartan form I_R of R is non-degenerate. Then we have*

$$\chi_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_1), \phi(\lambda_2)) = \chi_R(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$$

for all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in K_0(R)$.

Proof. Set $\chi'_R(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) := \chi_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_1),\phi(\lambda_2))$ for all $\lambda_1,\lambda_2 \in K_0(R)$. By the Serre duality for $\chi_{R'}$ and the commutativity $c_{R'}\circ\phi = \phi\circ c_R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_R(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) &= I_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_1),\phi(\lambda_2)) \\
&= \chi_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_1),\phi(\lambda_2)) + \chi_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_2),\phi(\lambda_1)) \\
&= \chi_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_1),\phi(\lambda_2)) + \chi_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_1),-c_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_2))) \\
&= \chi_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_1),\phi(\lambda_2)) + \chi_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_1),\phi(-c_R(\lambda_2))) \\
&= \chi_{R'}(\phi(\lambda_1),\phi((1-c_R)(\lambda_2))) \\
&= \chi'_R(\lambda_1,(1-c_R)(\lambda_2)) \\
&= \chi'_R(\lambda_1,(\chi_R^{-1}\circ\chi_R\circ(1-c_R))(\lambda_2)) \qquad (2.5)\\
&= \chi'_R(\lambda_1,(\chi_R^{-1}\circ I_R)(\lambda_2)). \qquad (2.6)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we regard the bilinear forms χ_R and I_R as elements of $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K_0(R),\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K_0(R),\mathbb{Z}))$ as in Lemma 2.14 in the lines (2.5) and (2.6). Therefore the non-degeneracy of I_R implies $\chi'_R\circ\chi_R^{-1} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(K_0(R),\mathbb{Z})}$ and hence $\chi'_R = \chi_R$. □

If the $\mathbb{Z}$–homomorphism ϕ has the nontrivial kernel, it is contradictory to the non-degenerate property of χ_R. Therefore the $\mathbb{Z}$–homomorphism ϕ is injective. Assume that $\phi\circ\phi_1 = \phi\circ\phi_2$ for morphisms $\phi_1,\phi_2 : R'' \to R$. Then the induced $\mathbb{Z}$–homomorphism on the lattices $\phi_1,\phi_2 : K_0(R'') \to K_0(R)$ are equal, and obviously, the induced maps on the sets of real roots $\phi_1,\phi_2 : \Delta_{re}(R'') \to \Delta_{re}(R)$ are also equal. Therefore the morphism ϕ is a monomorphism if I_R is non-degenerate. □

Remark 2.18. If the Cartan form I_R is degenerate, there is an example of a morphism which is not a monomorphism. Let R be the simply-laced generalized root system which is generated by the root basis $(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)$ satisfying $I_R(\alpha_i,\alpha_j) = 2$ for $i,j = 1,2,3$. Moreover we set R' the simply-laced generalized root system which is generated by β_1. Then we can check that the $\mathbb{Z}$-linear map $\phi : K_0(R) \to K_0(R')$ mapping α_i to β_1 for $i = 1,2,3$ induces a morphism which is not a monomorphism by easy calculation.

3. Classification of Positive definite generalized root systems

3.1. **Positive definite generalized root systems.** In this subsection, we shall show irreducible simply-laced generalized root systems with positive definite Cartan forms contain irreducible classical root systems as parts of them.

Definition 3.1. A simply-laced generalized root system $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ is called *positive definite* if the Cartan form I_R on $K_0(R)\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbb{R}$ is positive definite.

Definition 3.2 (Section 6.1.1 in [1])**.** Let V be a μ-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-vector space with an inner product $(-,-)$. A subset $\Phi \subset V$ is called a *simply-laced classical root system* of V if it satisfies the followings:

(i) Φ is a finite set such that $(v,v) = 2$ for all $v \in \Phi$ and $\mathbb{R}\Phi = V$.

(ii) For $\alpha \in \Phi$, the reflection r_α of V is defined as follows;

$$r_\alpha(\lambda) := \lambda - (\lambda, \alpha)\alpha, \quad \lambda \in V.$$

For $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$, $r_\alpha(\beta) \in \Phi$.

(iii) For $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$, $(\beta, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(iv) If $\alpha, c\alpha \in \Phi$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, then $c = \pm 1$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ be a positive definite generalized root system. The set of real roots $\Delta_{re}(R)$ is a classical root system of $K_0(R) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ with the inner product I_R.*

Proof. By the condition (iii) in Definition 2.1, the condition (ii) in Definition 3.2 is satisfied. Since $I_R(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta_{re}(R) \subset K_0(R)$, the condition (ii) in Definition 3.2 is satisfied. By Lemma 2.4, the condition (iv) in Definition 3.2 is satisfied. By the condition (i) and (ii) in Definition 2.1, we only need to show the following

Lemma 3.4. *The set of real roots $\Delta_{re}(R)$ is a finite set.*

Proof. Let $B = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_\mu)$ be a root basis. Set $\alpha = c_1\alpha_1 + c_2\alpha_2 + \cdots + c_\mu\alpha_\mu \in \Delta_{re}(R) \setminus B$ where $c_1,\ c_2\ \ldots, c_\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define the Cartan matrix $C \in M(n, \mathbb{Z})$ as follows:

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} I_R(\alpha_1, \alpha_1) & \cdots & I_R(\alpha_\mu, \alpha_1) \\ I_R(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) & \cdots & I_R(\alpha_\mu, \alpha_2) \\ \vdots & & \\ I_R(\alpha_1, \alpha_\mu) & \cdots & I_R(\alpha_\mu, \alpha_\mu) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrix C is invertible since I_R is positive definite and $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_\mu\}$ are linearly independent. Then we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \\ \vdots \\ c_\mu \end{pmatrix} = C^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} I_R(\alpha, \alpha_1) \\ I_R(\alpha, \alpha_2) \\ \vdots \\ I_R(\alpha, \alpha_\mu) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the exactly same argument in classical root systems (cf. Section 6.1.3 in [1]), we have $-2 \leq I_R(\alpha, \beta) \leq 2$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta_{re}(R)$, in particular, $I_R(\alpha, \beta) = \pm 2$ if and only if $\alpha = \pm\beta$. Since $I_R(\alpha, \alpha_i) \in \mathbb{Z}$, the cardinality of $\Delta_{re}(R)$ is at most $3^\mu + \mu$. □

We have finished the proof of the proposition. □

3.2. **Admissible diagrams.** In this subsection, we recall admissible diagrams and their properties introduced and studied by R. W. Carter. Then see [2] and also [9] for proofs of assertions in this subsection.

We denote by $(-,-)$ an inner product on a μ-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-vector space V, by $\Phi \subset V$ a classical root system and by W the Weyl group associated to Φ throughout this and next sections.

Definition 3.5. Assume that an element $w \in W$ is expressed as

$$w = (r_{\beta_1} r_{\beta_2} \cdots r_{\beta_{k_1}})(r_{\beta_{k_1+1}} r_{\beta_{k_1+2}} \cdots r_{\beta_{k_2}}), \quad 1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \mu, \tag{3.1}$$

such that

(i) $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{k_1}, \beta_{k_1+1}, \ldots, \beta_{k_2} \in \Phi$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$,
(ii) $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{k_1}$ are orthogonal to each other and $\beta_{k_1+1}, \ldots, \beta_{k_2}$ are also orthogonal to each other.

We call an expression (3.1) an *admissible representation* of w. An element w is called *admissible* if an admissible representation of w satisfies

$$W = \langle r_{\beta_1}, \ldots, r_{\beta_{k_1}}, r_{\beta_{k_1+1}}, \ldots, r_{\beta_{k_2}} \rangle.$$

For an admissible element $w \in W$ with an expression (3.1), an *admissible diagram* associated to w is defined as follows:

(i) the set of vertices is $\{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{k_1}, \beta_{k_1+1}, \ldots, \beta_{k_2}\}$,
(ii) the edge between the vertices β_i and β_j is given by the following rule:

$\circ_{\beta_i} \quad \circ_{\beta_j}$ if $(\beta_i, \beta_j) = 0$,

$\circ_{\beta_i}$ —— $\circ_{\beta_j}$ if $(\beta_i, \beta_j) \neq 0$.

Proposition 3.6 (Theorem A in [2], Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 6.5 in [9])**.** *We have the followings*:

(i) *Assume that Φ is irreducible. For two expressions* (3.1) *of an admissible element $w \in W$, admissible diagrams associated to them are isomorphic to each other.*

(ii) *If Φ is irreducible, then the admissible diagram associated to $w \in W$ is isomorphic to the one of following diagrams*:

A_μ :



D_μ :



$(4 \leq \mu)$

$D_\mu(a_k)$:



$(4 \leq \mu, 1 \leq k \leq \left[\frac{\mu+1}{2}\right])$

E_6 :



$E_6(a_1)$:



$E_6(a_2)$:



E_7 :



$E_7(a_1)$:



$E_7(a_2)$:



$E_7(a_3)$:



$E_7(a_4)$:



E_8 :



$E_8(a_1)$:



$E_8(a_2)$:



$E_8(a_3)$:



$E_8(a_4)$:



$E_8(a_5)$:



$E_8(a_6)$:



$E_8(a_7)$:



$E_8(a_8)$:



The next proposition follows from Theorem A, Theorem B, Proposition 21 in [2]:

Proposition 3.7. *We have the followings*:

(i) *For a diagram A in Proposition 3.6* (ii)*, there exists a pair of a classical root system and an admissible element (Φ, w) such that the admissible diagram associated to w is isomorphic to A.*

(ii) *If a pair (Φ, w) gives the diagram A_μ, D_μ or $D_\mu(a_k)$, E_6 or $E_6(a_k)$, E_7 or $E_7(a_k)$, E_8 or $E_8(a_k)$ in Proposition 3.6, then Φ is the one of types A_μ D_μ, E_6, E_7, E_8 respectively.*

(iii) *If the admissible diagram associated to w is isomorphic to the one associated to w' for pairs (Φ, w) and (Φ', w'), then Φ is isomorphic to Φ'.*

3.3. **Classification.** Admissible diagrams by R. W. Carter associated to their Coxteter elements enable us to classify positive definite generalized root systems.

We denote by $R = (K_0(R), I_R, \Delta_{re}(R), c_R)$ an irreducible positive definite generalized root systems throughout this subsection.

The next proposition follows from Lemma 3, Lemma 5 and Theorem C in [2]:

Proposition 3.8. *Any element in W can be expressed by an admissible representation.*

The following is the key proposition to connect irreducible positive definite generalized root systems with admissible diagrams.

Proposition 3.9. *The Coxeter element c_R is admissible.*

Proof. Take an admissible representation $c_R = (r_{\beta_1} r_{\beta_2} \cdots r_{\beta_k})(r_{\beta_{k+1}} r_{\beta_{k+2}} \cdots r_{\beta_{k'}})$ of the Coxeter element.

Lemma 3.10 (Lemma 3 in [2]). *For an element $w' \in W$, set $\mathrm{l}(w') := \min\{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid w' = r_{\alpha_1} r_{\alpha_2} \cdots r_{\alpha_k},\ \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_k \in \Phi\}$. For the element $w = r_{\gamma_1} \cdots r_{\gamma_k} \in W$, one has $k = \mathrm{l}(w)$ if and only if $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k \in \Phi$ are linearly independent.*

Denote a root basis of R by $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\mu)$. It is obvious that $k' \leq \mu$ since $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{k'}$ are linearly independent and $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\mu)$ are root basis. If $k' < \mu$, the elements $\alpha_1, \ldots \alpha_\mu$ would be linearly dependent by Lemma 3.10. However the elements $\alpha_1, \ldots \alpha_\mu$ must be linear independent since they form a root basis. Therefore an admissible representation of c_R is written as $c_R = (r_{\beta_1} r_{\beta_2} \cdots r_{\beta_k})(r_{\beta_{k+1}} r_{\beta_{k+2}} \cdots r_{\beta_\mu})$ where $1 \leq k \leq \mu$.

Lemma 3.11. *Take an element $c \in W$ and an admissible representation of c, $c = (r_{\beta_1} \cdots r_{\beta_{k_1}})(r_{\beta_{k_1+1}} \cdots r_{\beta_{k_2}})$ where $1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \mu$. There exists the positive definite generalized root system R' whose root basis is the ordered set $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{k_1}, \beta_{k_1+1}, \ldots, \beta_{k_2})$ and, in particular, whose Coxeter element is c.*

Proof. Define the simply-laced generalized root system $R' = (K_0(R'), I_{R'}, \Delta_{re}(R'), c_{R'})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} K_0(R') &:= \mathbb{Z}\beta_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\beta_{k_2}, \\ I_{R'}(\beta_i, \beta_j) &:= I_R(\beta_i, \beta_j) \quad (1 \leq i \neq i \leq k_2), \\ W(R') &:= \langle r_{\beta_1}, \ldots, r_{\beta_{k_2}} \rangle, \\ \Delta_{re}(R') &:= W(R')\{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{k_2}\}, \\ c_{R'} &:= (r_{\beta_1} r_{\beta_2} \cdots r_{\beta_{k_1}})(r_{\beta_{k_1+1}} r_{\beta_{k_1+2}} \cdots r_{\beta_{k_2}}). \end{aligned}$$

The elements $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{k_1}, \beta_{k_1+1}, \ldots, \beta_{k_2}$ are linear independent over $\mathbb{R}$ by Definition 3.5. It is obvious that a root basis of R' is $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{k_1}, \beta_{k_1+1}, \ldots, \beta_{k_2})$. Moreover R' is positive definite since R is so. It is also obvious that $c_{R'}$ is the Coxeter element of R'. □

Lemma 3.11 gives the natural simply-laced generalized root system R' whose root basis is $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k, \beta_{k+1}, \ldots, \beta_\mu)$. Then we have the natural monomorphism $\iota : R' \longrightarrow R$ since the root basis $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k, \beta_{k+1}, \ldots, \beta_\mu)$ is a subset of $\Delta_{re}(R)$ and $c_R = c_{R'}$.

Let $\chi_R|_{R'}$ be the restriction of χ_R to $K_0(R')$. By Theorem 2.11, we have

$$\chi_R|_{R'} = \chi_{R'}.$$

Let $A, B \in M_\mu(\mathbb{R})$ be the matrix representations of $\chi_R|_{R'}, \chi_{R'}$ under the root beses above respectively. Since $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\mu) \subset K_0(R)$, there exists the matrix P satisfying

$$(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\mu) = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\mu)P, \quad P \in M_\mu(\mathbb{Z}),$$

$$B = P^T A P.$$

Then $P \in \mathrm{GL}(\mu, \mathbb{Z})$ since $\det A = \det B = 1$ and $\det P = \pm 1$. We have $K_0(R) = K_0(R')$ and $I_R = I_{R'}$. Hence R and R' have the sets of real roots which is isomorphic to the classical root system defined by I_R. Therefore we have $W(R) = W(R')$ and c_R is admissible. □

By Proposition 3.9, the Coxeter element is admissible. Hence we can choose the diagram A_R in Proposition 3.6 (ii) which is isomorphic to the admissible diagram associated to the Coxeter element c_R of R. Therefore we have the map φ from the set $\mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}}$ of irreducible positive definite generalized root systems to the set Γ of diagrams in Proposition 3.6 (ii):

$$\varphi : \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}} \longrightarrow \Gamma, \quad R \mapsto A_R.$$

We denote the natural equivalence relation on $\mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}}$ by $R \sim R'$ if and only if R is isomorphic to R'. Under this notation, we have the main theorem of this section:

Theorem 3.12. *The map*

$$\varphi : \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}} \longrightarrow \Gamma, \quad R \mapsto A_R,$$

induces the natural bijection:

$$\overline{\varphi} : \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}}/\sim \xrightarrow{\cong} \Gamma, \quad [R] \mapsto A_R,$$

where $[R]$ *is the isomorphism class of* $R \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathrm{irr,pd}}$.

Proof. We divide the proof of this theorem into the following three steps.

(i) $\overline{\varphi}$ **is well-defined.**

Lemma 3.13. *If* R *is isomorphic to* R'*, then the admissible diagram associated to* c_R *is isomorphic to the one associated to* $c_{R'}$.

Proof. Assume that there exists an isomorphism $\phi : R \longrightarrow R'$. We denote by $c_R = (r_{\alpha_1} r_{\alpha_2} \cdots r_{\alpha_k})(r_{\alpha_{k+1}} \cdots r_{\alpha_\mu})$ an admissible representation of c_R. By Lemma 2.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \circ c_R \circ \phi^{-1} &= \phi \circ (r_{\alpha_1} r_{\alpha_2} \cdots r_{\alpha_k} r_{\alpha_{k+1}} \cdots r_{\alpha_\mu}) \circ \phi^{-1} \\ &= (\phi \circ r_{\alpha_1} \circ \phi^{-1})(\phi \circ r_{\alpha_2} \circ \phi^{-1}) \cdots (\phi \circ r_{\alpha_\mu} \circ \phi^{-1}) \\ &= r_{\phi(\alpha_1)} r_{\phi(\alpha_2)} \cdots r_{\phi(\alpha_\mu)} \\ &= (r_{\phi(\alpha_1)} r_{\phi(\alpha_2)} \cdots r_{\phi(\alpha_k)})(r_{\phi(\alpha_{k+1})} \cdots r_{\phi(\alpha_\mu)}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

By Definition 2.6 (iii), we have $c_{R'} = (r_{\phi(\alpha_1)} r_{\phi(\alpha_2)} \cdots r_{\phi(\alpha_k)})(r_{\phi(\alpha_{k+1})} \cdots r_{\phi(\alpha_\mu)})$. Moreover the representation (3.3) should be an admissible representation of $c_{R'}$ by Definition 2.6 (i). Again by Definition 2.6 (i), the admissible diagram associated to c_R is isomorphic to the one associated to $c_{R'}$ under above admissible representations. □

(ii) $\overline{\varphi}$ **is injective.**

The following lemma is necessary to show that $\overline{\varphi}$ is injective.

Lemma 3.14. *If the admissible diagram associated to* c_R *is isomorphic to the admissible diagram associated to* $c_{R'}$*, then there exists an* $\mathbb{R}$*–isometric isomorphism* $f : K_0(R) \otimes \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow K_0(R') \otimes \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $f(\Delta_{re}(R)) = \Delta_{re}(R')$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.7, the classical root system obtained from the admissible diagram associated to c_R is isomorphic to the one obtained from the admissible diagram associated to $c_{R'}$. Then there exists an isomorphism between $\Delta_{re}(R)$ and $\Delta_{re}(R')$. Denote by $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\mu\}$ a classical root basis of the classical root system obtained from R. Here we

can choose a classical root basis $\{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\mu\}$ of the classical root system obtained from R' such that

$$I_{R'}(\beta_i, \beta_j) = I_R(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \quad (1 \leq i \neq j \leq \mu).$$

This Lemma holds. □

Proposition 3.15 (Theorem 6.5 in [9]). *Assume that Φ is irreducible and w_1, $w_2 \in W$ are admissible elements whose admissible diagrams are isomorphic to each other. If Φ is the one of types $A_\mu, D_\mu, E_6, E_7, E_8$, then w_1 and w_2 are conjugate.*

Combining above lemma and proposition, we show that $\overline{\varphi}$ is injective.

Lemma 3.16. *If the admissible diagram associated to c_R is isomorphic to the one associated to $c_{R'}$, then R is isomorphic to R'.*

Proof. Assume that the admissible diagram associated to c_R is isomorphic to the one associated to $c_{R'}$. We denote the admissible representations of c_R and $c_{R'}$ by $c_R = (r_{\alpha_1} r_{\alpha_2} \cdots r_{\alpha_k})(r_{\alpha_{k+1}} \cdots r_{\alpha_\mu})$ and $c_{R'} = (r_{\beta_1} r_{\beta_2} \cdots r_{\beta_k})(r_{\beta_{k+1}} \cdots r_{\beta_\mu})$ respectively.

By Lemma 3.14, there exists an element $c \in W(R)$, whose admissible representation is given by $(r_{\beta'_1} r_{\beta'_2} \cdots r_{\beta'_k})(r_{\beta'_{k+1}} \cdots r_{\beta'_\mu})$, satisfying the following;

$$I_R(\beta'_i, \beta'_j) = I_{R'}(\beta_i, \beta_j) \quad (1 \leq i \neq j \leq \mu).$$

Lemma 3.11 gives the natural generalized root system R'' whose root basis is $(\beta'_1, \ldots, \beta'_\mu)$. Then R'' is isomorphic to R'. Indeed, if we set a linear map ϕ by

$$\phi : K_0(R'') \longrightarrow K_0(R'), \quad \beta'_i \longmapsto \beta_i,$$

it is obvious from the construction of $(\beta'_1, \ldots, \beta'_\mu)$ that ϕ defines a morphism and ϕ is isomorphism. Here the admissible diagram associated to c_R is isomorphic to the one associated to c. By Proposition 3.15, c_R and c are conjugate in $W(R)$, namely, there exists an element $w \in W(R)$ satisfying

$$c_R = w^{-1} c w.$$

If we define the $\mathbb{Z}$-linear map as follows;

$$\psi : K_0(R) \longrightarrow K_0(R'), \quad \alpha \longmapsto w(\alpha),$$

then ψ defines a morphism and ψ is the isomorphism. Therefore $\psi \circ \phi : R \longrightarrow R'$ is the isomorphism between R and R'. □

(iii) **$\overline{\varphi}$ is surjective.**

Lemma 3.17. *For a diagram A in Proposition 3.6* (ii)*, there is an irreducible positive definite generalized root system R such that an admissible diagram associated to c_R is isomorphic to A.*

Proof. This lemma follows from Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 3.11. □

We have finished the proof of this theorem. □

References

[1] N. Bourbaki, *Groupes et algebres de Lie: Chapitres 4,5 et 6*, Elements de Mathematique. Hermann, Paris (1968), 116–275.

[2] R. W. Carter, *Conjugacy classes in the Weyl group*, Compositio Mathematica. 25 (1972), 1–59.

[3] A. Hubery and H. Krause, *A Categorification of Non-crossing Partitions*, to appear in Journal of the European Mathematical Society, arXiv:1310.1907.

[4] K. Saito, *Around the Theory of the Generalized Weight System: Relations with Singularity Theory, the Generalized Weyl Group and Its Invariant Theory, Etc.*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2) **183** (1998), 101–143.

[5] K. Saito, *Extended Affine Root Systems I* (*Coxeter transformations*), Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **21** (1985), 75–179.

[6] K. Saito and T. Takebayashi, *Extended Affine Root Systems III* (*Elliptic Weyl Groups*), Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ. **33** (1997), 301–329.

[7] Y. Shiraishi and A. Takahashi, *On the Frobenius Manifolds for Cusp Singularities*, Advances in Mathematics, **274** (2015), 485–522.

[8] Y. Shiraishi, A. Takahashi and K. Wada, *On Weyl Groups and Artin Groups Associated to Orbifold Projective Lines*, Journal of Algebra, **453** (2016), 249–290.

[9] R. Stekolshchik, *Root systems and diagram calculus. I. Regular extentions of Carter diagrams and the uniqueness of conjugacy classes*, arXiv:1005.2769v6.

[10] A. Takahashi, *Mirror symmetry between orbifold projective lines and cusp singularities*, "Singularities in Geometry and Topology 2011", Adv. Stud. Pure Math 66. (2015), 257–282.

Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science, Osaka University, Toyonaka Osaka, 560-0043, Japan

E-mail address: u891956f@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science, Kyoto University, Kyoto, 606-8202, Japan

E-mail address: yshiraishi@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science, Osaka University, Toyonaka Osaka, 560-0043, Japan

E-mail address: takahashi@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp